U.S. Appln. No.: 10/629,650

Attorney Docket No.: Q76784

**REMARKS** 

Claims 1, 5-10 and 21-29 are all the claims pending in the application. By virtue of this

Amendment, non-elected claims 11-20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 24-29 have been newly added herewith.

**Claim Rejections** 

A) Claims 1, 7, 10 and 22

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kohama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,070). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that spacers are located in a first part of the liquid crystal layer

corresponding to the display region and that no spacers are located in a second part of the liquid-

crystal layer corresponding to the non-display region. The Examiner asserts that Kohama

teaches a display region R1 and spacers 40. Referring to Fig. 25, the Examiner asserts that

Kohama teaches that the spacers are located only in the display region R1 and not in the non-

display region. However, Fig. 25 does not particularly indicate the bounds of the display region

R1. On the other hand, Fig. 24 (which is the same embodiment as Fig. 25, but shows a different

view) does show the display region and also shows that the spacers 40 located outside of the

display region R1. Fig. 24 has been reproduced below with the reference numbers for the

spacers 40 and display region R1 identified. As is clearly seen, contrary to the claimed

U.S. Appln. No.: 10/629,650 Attorney Docket No.: Q76784

invention, the alleged Kohama spacers 40 are outside of the display region R1 and are in a non-

display region.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Kohama.

Applicant also submits that claim 22 is allowable for reasons similar to claim 1.

Claims 7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

U.S. Appln. No.: 10/629,650

Attorney Docket No.: Q76784

B) **Claims 5, 6 and 21** 

Claims 5, 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kohama in view of Jun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,873,391). Claims 5, 6 and 21 depend from

claim 1. Applicant submits that Jun does not correct the above-noted deficiencies of Kohama

with respect to claim 1 and that claims 5, 6 and 21 are therefore allowable at least by virtue of

their dependency.

**C**) Claims 8 and 23

Claims 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kohama in view of Kijima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,500). Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and

claim 23 depends from claim 22. Applicant submits that Kijima does not correct the above-

noted deficiencies of Kohama with respect to claims 1 and 22 and that claims 8 and 23 are

therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

D) Claim 9

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohama in view

of Kurauchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,572). Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Applicant submits that

Kurauchi does not correct the above-noted deficiencies of Kohama with respect to claim 1 and

that claim 9 therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Kohama would not have been modified with

Kurauchi as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner asserts that Kohama would have been

modified with Kurauchi to include pole-shaped spacers. However, the spacers of Kohama are

formed in rows for the specific purpose of directing the flow of liquid crystal. The pole-shaped

spacers of Kurauchi would not provide the same flow control as the Kohama spacers and would

U.S. Appln. No.: 10/629,650

Attorney Docket No.: Q76784

thus defeat the purpose of the Kohama disclosure. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that

claim 9 is further allowable because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified

Kohama with Kurauchi as suggested by the Examiner.

New Claims

Claims 24-29 have been newly added herewith. Claims 24-26 depend from claim 1 and

claims 27-29 depend from claim 22. Accordingly, claims 24-29 are allowable at least by virtue

of their respective dependencies.

**Conclusion** 

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Respectfully submitted, /Howard L. Bernstein/

Registration No. 25,665

Howard L. Bernstein

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

WASHINGTON OFFICE

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 31, 2007